arXiv:math/0510401v1 [math.CA] 19 Oct 2005

MAXIMAL SMOOTHNESS OF THE ANTI-ANALYTIC PART OF A TRIGONOMETRIC NULL SERIES

GADY KOZMA AND ALEXANDER OLEVSKIĬ

ABSTRACT. We proved recently [6] that the anti-analytic part of a trigonometric series ,converging to zero almost everywhere, may belong to L^2 on the circle. Here we prove that it can even be C^∞, and we characterize precisely the possible degree of smoothness in terms of the rate of decrease of the Fourier coefficients. This sharp condition might be viewed as a "new quasi-analyticity ".

1. RESULTS

The classical Menshov example shows that a (nontrivial) trigonometric series

$$\sum c(n)e^{int} \tag{1}$$

may converge to zero almost everywhere (a.e.). Such a series is called a null series. This result was the origin of modern uniqueness theory in Fourier Analysis, see [1, 4, 5]. A null series can not be analytic, that is involve positive frequencies only. This follows from Abel and Privalov theorems. On the other hand, we proved recently [6] that the anti-analytic part can be small in the sense that

$$\sum_{n<0} |c(n)|^2 < \infty. \tag{2}$$

It turns out that a much stronger property is possible: the anti-analytic part can be infinitely smooth.

Theorem 1. *There exists a trigonomteric series (1) convergent to zero a.e., such that*

$$c(n) = O(1/|n|^k) \ (n<0) \text{ for every } k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Moreover the following result is true :

Theorem 2. *Let ω be a function $\mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $\omega(t)/t$ concave and*

$$\sum \frac{1}{\omega(n)} = \infty. \tag{3}$$

Then there exists a null-series such that the amplitudes in the negative spectrum satisfy the condition:

$$c(n) = O(\exp(-\omega(\log|n|))), \ n<0. \tag{4}$$

It is remarkable that the condition is sharp. The following uniqueness theorem is true.

Research supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation.

Theorem 3. *If a series (1) converges to zero a.e., and the coefficients satisfy the condition (4), where $\omega(t)/t$ increase and*

$$\sum \frac{1}{\omega(n)} < \infty, \tag{5}$$

then $c(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

So for series (1) converging a.e. on the circle, (4) and (5) appears as a sharp quasi-analyticity condition for the amplitudes of the negative spectrum, which ensures the uniqueness property. Those amplitudes of a null series may, for example, decrease as $n^{-\log\log n}$ but not as $n^{-(\log\log n)^2}$.

With respect to Theorem 3, it should be mentioned that if one replaces convergence a.e. with convergence on a set E of positive mesaure, then a sharp uniqueness condition is the usual quasi-analyticity:

$$c(n) = O(\exp(-\rho(n))) \quad (n < 0), \quad \sum \frac{\rho(n)}{n^2} = \infty. \tag{6}$$

This follows from Beurling theorem [2] extended by Borichev [3], which implies that a series (1), (6) converging on E to zero is trivial. The sharpness follows from classical results, see [7]. In fact, in [3], the sum of the analytic part of (1) is understood (like in Privalov theorem) as a non-tangential boundary limit, which is assumed to exist on E. In this setting uniqueness holds under doubly exponentional growth condition of this part in the disc. Our theorem 3 also admits such a version, but the growth conditions necessary are much stronger.

Below we give a sketch of the ideas involved in the proof of theorem 1. Theorem 2 can be obtained basically by the same approach. We do not discuss here the proof of theorem 3.

In the proof below we construct a probabilistically-skewed "thick" Cantor set K of measure zero and a random harmonic function f on the disk with singularities on K. Taking $F = \exp(f + i\widetilde{f})$ and denoting by F^* the boundary value of F on the circle, we shall show that F^* is smooth and that the Taylor coefficients $\widehat{F}(n) \to 0$ with probability 1. Hence the coefficients $c(n) := \widehat{F}(n) - \widehat{F^*}(n)$ are the Fourier coefficients of a singular compactly supported distribution on $\mathbb{T}$ and $c(n) \to 0$, which gives, by [4, p. 54], that (1) converges to zero almost everywhere, as required.

It is interesting to compare the proof to the one used in [6]. There f was the Poisson integral of a singular (non-stochastic) measure on K. This approach, however, cannot work here, even if f is taken to be the sum of a singular measure and an L^1 function.

2. Construction

Let

$$\sigma_n := \frac{1}{2^n \log(n+2)} \quad n \geq 1, \quad \sigma_0 = 1, \tag{7}$$

$$\tau_n := \frac{1}{12}(\sigma_{n-1} - 2\sigma_n) \approx \frac{1}{2^n n \log^2 n} \tag{8}$$

where $X \approx Y$ stands, as usual, for $cX \leq Y \leq CX$, and where c and C stand, here and everywhere, for some absolute constants. Let $l \in C^\infty\,]0,1]$ be a function satisfying $l(x) = -\log^2 x$ for $x < 1/3$, $l(x) = -1$ for $x > 2/3$ and $l \leq -1$ everywhere.

Given $s \in [0,1]$ define functions on $\mathbb{R}$

$$l^{\pm}(x;s) := \begin{cases} l(x) & 0 < x \le 1 \\ -1 & 1 < x \le 2 \pm s \\ l(3 \pm s - x) & 2 \pm s < x \le 3 \pm s \end{cases}$$

and 0 otherwise.

Assume at the n'th step of induction that we have 2^n intervals $I(n,k)$ of length σ_n (intervals of rank n), and let $K_n := \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^n-1} I(n,k)$; assume also we have a function $f_n : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_n|_{I(n,k)} = M(n)$ i.e. some constant independent of k. Examine one $I = I(n,k)$. Divide I into two equal parts, $I = I' \cup I''$. f_{n+1} will now be defined on the sides of I' using

$$f_{n+1} := \begin{cases} n\sqrt{\log n} \cdot l^{+}(x/\tau_{n+1}; s) & \text{left side of } I' \\ n\sqrt{\log n} \cdot l^{-}(x/\tau_{n+1}; s) & \text{right side of } I' \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

which leaves a space of $\frac{1}{2}\sigma_n - 6\tau_{n+1} = \sigma_{n+1}$ in I' undefined — this will be $I(n+1, 2k)$. We fix M_{n+1} from the condition

$$\int_{I'} f_{n+1} - f_n = 0 \tag{10}$$

and it is clear that M_{n+1} does not depend on s. Repeat the construction inside I'' with $s = s(n+1, 2k+1)$. We remark that the factor $n\sqrt{\log n}$ in (9), or to be more precise, the fact that it is superlinear, is the one that guarantees that the final function F is C^∞.

For now the choice of the $s(n,k)$ is arbitrary. It is only for the last step, that we will take the $s(n,k)$ to be random (independent and uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$). Then we will prove that a null series with smooth anti-analytic part is generated for almost any choice of s-es.

3. Estimates

3.1. **The maximum of f_n.** The magnitude of the τ_n (8) together with (9) gives that the negative part of f_n of rank i has integral $\approx \log^{-3/2} i$, and hence a sum and (7) gives

$$M_n \approx \frac{n}{\sqrt{\log n}}. \tag{11}$$

Similarly, for any interval I of rank $n-1$,

$$\int_I |f_n(x) - f_{n-1}(x)| \overset{(10)}{=} 2\int_I (f_n - f_{n-1})^- \approx \frac{1}{2^n \log^{3/2} n} \le C2^{-n}. \tag{12}$$

We remark that the fact that M_n is sublinear is the one that guarantees that our final F will have $\widehat{F}(m) \to 0$. Hence the proof hinges around the following, somewhat paradoxical situation: even though K has measure zero, it is sufficiently thick so that it would be possible to balance superlinear growth outside K (the $n\sqrt{\log n}$ factor in (9)) with sublinear growth inside K. The proof of theorem 2 explores this effect to its maximum.

3.2. **The limit of the f_n.** We identify $[0,1]$ with the circle $\{|z|=1\}$, extend f_n as harmonic functions into the disk $\mathbb{D}$ and denote the extensions by f_n as well. We need to estimate f_n and their derivatives f_n^D (we mean tangential derivative, i.e. if $f = f(re^{2\pi i\theta})$ then $f' := \frac{df}{d\theta}$). Using (10), (12), integration by parts and standard estimates for the derivatives of the Poisson kernel one can prove:

$$|f_{n+1}^{(D)}(z) - f_n^{(D)}(z)| \le \frac{C(D)}{2^n d(z,K_n)^{D+1}} \quad \forall z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus K_n,\ \forall D \in \{0,1,\dots\} \tag{13}$$

where $d(z,K)$ denotes the distance of the point z from the set K. Denote by $\widetilde{f_n}$ the harmonic conjugate of f_n. Using the conjugate Poisson kernel we get the same estimate for $|\widetilde{f_{n+1}}^{(D)}(z) - \widetilde{f_n}^{(D)}(z)|$.

These two inequalities show that f_n and $\widetilde{f_n}$ converge uniformly on compact subsets of $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus K$. Denote their limits by f and $\widetilde{f}$ respectively — $\lim \widetilde{f_n}$ is clearly the conjugate of $\lim f_n$, which justifies the notation $\widetilde{f}$.

The boundary values of f are simple to estimate, as $f|_{[0,1]\setminus K_n} \equiv f_n|_{[0,1]\setminus K_n}$. Hence, directly from the definitions of f_n and l we get that f has singularities on K and on a countable set of points Q — the boundaries and middles of all the intervals $I(n,k)$. Denote $K' := K \cup Q$. From (13) and properties of f_n one can deduce that on $\mathbb{T}$,

$$|f^{(D)}(x)| \le \frac{C(D)}{d(x,K')^{D+1}}. \tag{14}$$

This also holds for $\widetilde{f}^{(D)}$, though it is necessary to first prove an analog of (14) for $\widetilde{f_n}$ uniformly in n and take the limit as $n \to \infty$. The estimate for $\widetilde{f_n}$ follows in turn from the estimate for f_n and estimates on the derivatives of the Hilbert kernel.

3.3. **Smoothness.** Define now $F = \exp(f + i\widetilde{f})$. We use the notation F^* for the boundary value, considered as a function on $\mathbb{T}$, in order to distinguish it from the "true" limit value of F on the boundary of the circle which is a distribution with a singular part supported on K. We note that F is not in H^∞ and therefore the coefficients $c(n) = \widehat{F}(n) - \widehat{F^*}(n)$ are non-trivial.

A rather straightforward calculation starting from (11) shows that

$$f(x) \le -c \log \frac{1}{d(x,K')} \sqrt{\log\log \frac{1}{d(x,K')}} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{T} \setminus K'. \tag{15}$$

Combining the fact that f goes to $-\infty$ faster than $\log 1/d(z,K')$ with the rough estimates of (14) (and the corresponding inequality for $\widetilde{f}$) one can prove that $F^* \in C^\infty([0,1])$.

4. Probability

Denote $F_n = \exp(f_n + i\widetilde{f_n})$ for $n = n(m) = \lfloor C \log m \rfloor$. Then another relatively simple conclusion from (13) is that for some C sufficiently large, the following inequality for Taylor coefficients holds

$$|\widehat{F_n}(m) - \widehat{F}(m)| = \int_{(1-1/m)\mathbb{T}} z^{-m-1}(F_n(z) - F(z))\, dz \le \frac{C}{m}. \tag{16}$$

We shall not give many details for the probabilistic argument. In general it uses a fourth moment calculation. Define therefore, for every $0 \le k < 2^n$,

$$\mathcal{I}_k = \int_{I(n,k)} F_n(x) e^{imx}\, dx$$

For which we have an absolute bound (from (11))

$$|\mathcal{I}_k| \le \int_{I(n,k)} |F_n(x)| \le \sigma_n e^{Cn/\sqrt{\log n}} =: \gamma_n = \gamma. \tag{17}$$

Lemma. *Let $0 \le k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 < 2^n$ and let $1 \le r \le n$, and assume that $I(n, k_i)$ belong to at least three different intervals of rank r. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{I}_{k_1}\mathcal{I}_{k_2}\mathcal{I}_{k_3}\mathcal{I}_{k_4}) \le \gamma^4 \frac{C \log^4 m}{m^2 \tau_r^3}.$$

Had we needed to estimate $\int f_n(x) e^{imx}$ the lemma would have been standard, since f has a local structure and by conditioning on the location of the intervals of rank r we would achieve independence between the various $\mathcal{I}_k$-s. However, F contains also the $\widetilde{f}$ component which is non-local. Still, it turns out that after the conditioning step we are left with a function of two variables which can be estimated by two (rather long) integrations by parts. We skip this calculation entirely.

Proceeding with the proof of the theorem, define

$$X = X_m = \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} \int_{I(n,k)} F_n(x) e^{imx}\, dx.$$

The difference $\widehat{F_n}(m) - X$ is the integral over the subset of $\mathbb{T}$ where $f_n = f$, and there F_n is C^∞ uniformly in n, and in particular this integral is $\le C/m$. Therefore we want to bound X, and we shall estimate $\mathbb{E}X^4$. Let

$$E(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) := \mathbb{E} \prod \mathcal{I}_{k_i}$$

let $r(k_1, \dots, k_4)$ be the minimal r such that $I(n, k_i)$ are contained in at least 3 different intervals of rank r. A simple calculation shows

$$\#\{(k_1, \dots, k_4) : r(k_1, \dots, k_4) = r\} \approx 2^{4n-2r}.$$

The estimate of the lemma is useless if r is too large. Let R be some number. For $r \ge R$ use the simple $|E(k_1, \dots, k_4)| \le \gamma^4$ and $\gamma = 2^{-n} m^{o(1)}$ to get

$$E_1 := \sum_{r(k_1,\dots,k_4) \ge R} E(k_1, \dots, k_4) \le C\gamma^4 2^{4n-2R} \le m^{o(1)} 2^{-2R}. \tag{18}$$

For smaller r, we use the lemma to get $E(k_1, \dots, k_4) \le \gamma^4 m^{-2+o(1)} \tau_r^{-3}$ and then, using $\tau_r = 2^{-r+o(r)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 :&= \sum_{r(k_1,\dots,k_4) < R} E(k_1, \dots, k_4) \le \gamma^4 2^{4n} m^{-2+o(1)} \sum_{r=1}^{R} 2^{-2r} \tau_r^{-3} = \\ &= m^{-2+o(1)} \sum_{r=1}^{R} 2^{r+o(r)} = m^{-2+o(1)} 2^{R+o(R)}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Picking $R = \lfloor \frac{2}{3} \log m \rfloor$ we get from (14) and (15) that $\mathbb{E} X_m^4 \leq m^{-4/3+o(1)}$ and hence $\mathbb{E}\left(\sum X_m^4\right) < \infty$ and in particular $X_m^4 \to 0$ with probability 1. As remarked above, this shows that $\widehat{F_n}(m) \to 0$ and hence using (16) that $\widehat{F}(m) \to 0$. □

REFERENCES

[1] N. K. Bary, *A treatise on trigonometric series*, Pergamon Press, 1964.

[2] A. Beurling, *Quasianaliticity*, The collected works, vol. 1, Birkhaüser (1989), 396–431.

[3] A. A. Borichev, *Boundary uniqueness theorems for almost analytic functions, and asymmetric algebras of sequences* (Russian), Matem. Sb. 136, 324–340 (1988). English translation: Math. USSR-Sb. 64:2 (1989), 323–338.

[4] J. P. Kahane and R. Salem, *Ensemles parfaits et series trigonometriques*, Hermann, 1994.

[5] A. Kechris and A. Louveau, *Descriptive set theory and the structure of sets of uniqueness*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

[6] G. Kozma and A. Olevskiĭ, *A null series with small anti-analytic part*, C. R. A. S. Paris, Ser. I 336 (2003), 475–478.

[7] S. Mandelbrojt, *Séries de Fourier et classes quasi-analytiques, de Fonctions*,1935, Gauthier-Villard, Paris.

E-mail address: gadykozma@hotmail.com

E-mail address: olevskii@post.tau.ac.il

TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, RAMAT AVIV 69978, ISRAEL